arXiv:1303.0026v1 [math.CO] 28 Feb 2013

WHEN HAMILTON CIRCUITS GENERATE THE CYCLE SPACE OF A RANDOM GRAPH

PETER HEINIG

Abstract. If $\varepsilon > 0$ and $p_n \geqslant n^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}$, in an Erdős–Rényi random graph a.a.s. the set of cycles which can be constructed as a symmetric difference of Hamilton circuits is as large as parity by itself permits (all cycles if n is odd, all even cycles if n is even).

Keywords: cycle space, Erdős–Rényi random graph, finite-dimensional vector spaces, Hamilton circuit, Hamilton-connected, consequences of structured spanning subgraphs

1. Main result

In the face of the apparent intractability of characterizing the property of hamiltonicity of a graph per se, one realistic course to take towards more knowledge is the study of global properties: for example, under the assumption that a given sufficient condition for hamiltonicity holds, results have been obtained about the *total number* of Hamilton circuits and their *relative position*; examples (with the sufficient condition being a mininum-degree-condition) are to be found in [5] and [3]. In [3, Theorem 1], a richness property (the set of Hamilton circuits generates the cycle space), previously known for certain Cayley-graphs only [1], was proved to hold in graphs of sufficiently high minimum degree. The main purpose of this note is to combine some recent results in order to prove a new result, Theorem 1, teaching us that sufficiently dense Erdős–Rényi random graphs a.a.s. have this property as well (for a vastly smaller edge-probability than what would a.a.s. force the minimum-degree-condition from [3, Theorem 1] to hold).

In Theorem 1, Properties (2) and (3) imply that, a.a.s., the set of cycles which can be constructed as a symmetric difference of Hamilton circuits is as large as parity alone permits, i.e. *all* cycles if n is odd, and all *even* cycles[1] if n is even. To see this, note that (3) is obviously equivalent to the statement that for odd n, every cycle of G is a symmetric difference of (edge-sets of) Hamilton-circuits of G; statement (2), however, does not[2] imply the even-cycles-statement, as a general statement about graphs, but on *most* models for the statement the implication *does* hold: a $G \sim G_{n,p_n}$ at $p_n = n^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}$ a.a.s. contains triangles. If n is even and if there were an even cycle $z \in \mathrm{Z}_1(G;\mathbb{Z}/2)$ not in the $\mathbb{Z}/2$-span of the Hamilton-circuits of G, then this cycle together with some triangle would represent two linearly independent elements modulo $\langle \mathcal{H}(G)\rangle_{\mathbb{Z}/2}$, in contradiction to $\dim_{\mathbb{Z}/2}\left(\mathrm{Z}_1(G;\mathbb{Z}/2)/\langle\mathcal{H}(G)\rangle_{\mathbb{Z}/2}\right) = 1$, which is a.a.s. guaranteed by (2).

Theorem 1. *If $\varepsilon > 0$, $p \in [0,1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $p_n \geqslant n^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}$, $\mathcal{H}(\cdot)$ denotes the set of all Hamilton circuits and $\mathrm{Z}_1(\cdot;\mathbb{Z}/2)$ the cycle space in the usual sense, then for $n \to \infty$ a random graph $G \sim G_{n,p_n}$ asymptotically almost surely has the following properties:*

(1) *the $\mathbb{Z}/2$-span of all circuits having length n or $n-1$ in G is $\mathrm{Z}_1(G;\mathbb{Z}/2)$,*
(2) *if n is even, the $\mathbb{Z}/2$-span of $\mathcal{H}(G)$ is a codimension-one subspace of $\mathrm{Z}_1(G;\mathbb{Z}/2)$,*
(3) *if n is odd, the $\mathbb{Z}/2$-span of $\mathcal{H}(G)$ is $\mathrm{Z}_1(G;\mathbb{Z}/2)$.*

---

[1] Meaning an element of the cycle space with a support of even size; even circuits are such elements.

[2] In a *bipartite* graph G, every even cycle being a symmetric difference of Hamilton circuits is obviously not the same as $\dim_{\mathbb{Z}/2}\left(\mathrm{Z}_1(G;\mathbb{Z}/2)/\langle\mathcal{H}(G)\rangle_{\mathbb{Z}/2}\right) = 1$; but in a non-bipartite graph—such as our G_{n,p_n}—it is.

As in [3] we denote by C_n^2 the square of an n-vertex circuit and by $\mathrm{Z}_1(G;\mathbb{Z}/2)$ the cycle space of a graph G in the standard graph-theoretical sense. The symbol $\mathcal{M}_{|\cdot|,0}$ denotes the set of all graphs which are simultaneously Hamilton-connected and Hamilton-generated (the latter means that every cycle is a symmetric difference of Hamilton circuits). The symbol $\mathcal{M}_{\{|\cdot|-1,|\cdot|\},0}$ denotes the set of all graphs G which simultaneously have the property that any two vertices are connected by a path of length at least $|G|-2$ and that the $\mathbb{Z}/2$-span of the set of all circuits of length at least $|G|-1$ is equal to $\mathrm{Z}_1(G;\mathbb{Z}/2)$. The symbol $\mathcal{M}_{|\cdot|,1}$ denotes the set of all graphs which are simultaneosly Hamilton-generated and have the property that the $\mathbb{Z}/2$-span of the set of all Hamilton-circuits has codimension one in $\mathrm{Z}_1(G;\mathbb{Z}/2)$.

Proof of Theorem 1. By a recent theorem of Kühn and Osthus [6, Theorem 1.2 specialized to $k=2$], we know that, asymptotically almost surely, G_{n,p_n} contains C_n^2 as a subgraph. By (a3), (a4) and (a5) in [3, Lemma 17], $\mathrm{C}_n^2 \in \mathcal{M}_{\{|\cdot|\},0}$ if n is odd, while both $\mathrm{C}_n^2 \in \mathcal{M}_{\{|\cdot|-1,|\cdot|\},0}$ and $\mathrm{C}_n^2 \in \mathcal{M}_{\{|\cdot|\},1}$ if n is even. By [3, Lemma 18.(1)], each of the graph properties $\mathcal{M}_{\{|\cdot|\},0}$, $\mathcal{M}_{\{|\cdot|-1,|\cdot|\},0}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\{|\cdot|\},1}$ is monotone. Therefore, a.a.s. G_{n,p_n} itself is in $\mathcal{M}_{\{|\cdot|\},0}$ for odd n (proving (3)), and in both $\mathcal{M}_{\{|\cdot|\},1}$ (proving (2)) and $\mathcal{M}_{\{|\cdot|-1,|\cdot|\},0}$ for even n. The latter completes the proof of (1), for although (1) is formulated without a parity condition, in the case of odd n, (1) is implied by (3) anyway. $\square$

2. Concluding remarks

It seems likely that one can significantly improve upon the function $n^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}$ in Theorem 1, possibly all the way down to the threshold $\frac{\log n+\log\log n+\omega(1)}{n}$, the edge-probability at which G_{n,p_n} first becomes a.a.s. hamiltonian. Some loose circumstantial evidence for that are the following two results, which provide examples that the above threshold guarantees much more than the mere existence of at least one Hamilton circuit.

In [4, Theorem 1.2], Krivelevich and Samotij proved that if $p_n \geqslant \frac{\log n}{n}$, then a $G \sim G_{n,p_n}$ a.a.s. realizes the obvious upper bound of $\lfloor \frac{1}{2}\delta(G) \rfloor$ pairwise edge-disjoint Hamilton circuits.

In [2], Glebov and Krivelevich found asymptotics for the total number of Hamilton circuits in G_{n,p_n}, starting right from the hamiltonicity-threshold $p_n = \frac{\log n+\log\log n+\omega(1)}{n}$.

An obvious necessary condition for an improvement of Theorem 1 is that the total number of Hamilton circuits a.a.s. be at least as large as $\dim_{\mathbb{Z}/2}\mathrm{Z}_1(G;\mathbb{Z}/2) = \|G\|-|G|+1$. On the one hand, if $p_n = \frac{\log n+\log\log n+\omega_n}{n}$ with $\omega_n \in \omega(1)$, we a.a.s. have $\|G\| \sim \frac{1}{2}n\log n$, hence a.a.s. $\dim_{\mathbb{Z}/2}\mathrm{Z}_1(G;\mathbb{Z}/2) \sim \frac{1}{2}n\log n$; on the other hand, by [2, Theorem 1] and Stirling's approximation, $|\mathcal{H}(G_{n,p_n})| \sim (2\pi n)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{\log n+\log\log n+\omega_n}{\mathrm{e}}\right)^n(1-o(1))^n$, which outgrows $\frac{1}{2}n\log n$. So the above necessary condition is satisfied as soon as G_{n,p_n} becomes hamiltonian at all. This prompts the question:

Question 2. *Does Theorem 1 remain true if* $n^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}$ *is replaced with* $\frac{\log n+\log\log n+\omega(1)}{n}$*?*

While an affirmative answer to Question 2 appears credible, a proof seems out of reach: below $n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, the sufficient reason provided by the theorem of Kühn and Osthus disappears, and one finds oneself without a means to tap into the monotonicity of the graph property $\mathcal{M}_{|\cdot|,0}$. Moreover, the customary arguments to show that a set of vectors is a generating system seem to carry with them an instability altogether unusual for arguments about G_{n,p_n}: for example, an argument which were to randomly choose a dimension-sized subset of distinct Hamilton-circuits and then go on to prove this subset to be a.a.s. linearly independent over $\mathbb{Z}/2$ would have to be so sensitive to the size of the subset to break down as soon as $1+\dim_{\mathbb{Z}/2}\ \mathrm{Z}_1(G;\mathbb{Z}/2)$ circuits would have been selected instead. It seems hard to believe that such an argument exists. Currently, the only hope seems to discover more economical 'rebar' than C_n^2 itself, by working on the following deterministic research problem:

Question 3. *What can be proved about the* minimal elements[3] *of the monotone property* $\mathcal{M}_{|\cdot|,0}$ *?*

There appear to be some indications that, with much work and current proof technology, one can improve $-\frac{1}{2}$ to $-\frac{2}{3}$ in Theorem 1.

References

1. Brian Alspach, Stephen C. Locke, and Dave Witte, *The Hamilton spaces of Cayley graphs on abelian groups*, Discrete Math. **82** (1990), no. 2, 113–126. MR 1057481 (91h:05058) [1]
2. Roman Glebov and Michael Krivelevich, *On the number of Hamilton cycles in sparse random graphs*, (2012), arXiv:1207.2748v1. [2]
3. Peter Heinig, *On prisms, Möbius ladders and the cycle space of dense graphs*, (2011), arXiv:1112.5101v1. [1, 2]
4. Michael Krivelevich and Wojciech Samotij, *Optimal Packings of Hamilton Cycles in Sparse Random Graphs*, SIAM J. Discrete Math. **26** (2012), no. 3, 964–982. MR 3022117 [2]
5. Daniela Kühn, John Lapinskas, and Deryk Osthus, *Optimal packings of Hamilton cycles in graphs of high minimum degree*, (2012), arXiv:1211.3263v1. To appear in Combinatorics, Probability and Computing. [1]
6. Daniela Kühn and Deryk Osthus, *On Pósa's Conjecture for Random Graphs*, SIAM J. Discrete Math. **26** (2012), no. 3, 1440–1457. MR 3022146 [2]

Zentrum Mathematik, M9, Technische Universität München,
Boltzmannstrasse 3, D-85747 Garching bei München, Germany
E-mail address: `heinig@ma.tum.de`

---

[3] The minimal elements appear to be complicated. The graph C_n^2 is *not* a minimal element of $\mathcal{M}_{|\cdot|,0}$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}_{|\cdot|,1}$): it is possible to remove an edge and still have an element of $\mathcal{M}_{|\cdot|,0}$ if n is odd (resp. still have an element of $\mathcal{M}_{|\cdot|,1}$ if n is even). One may then descend far further—by deleting edges while still staying within the property—but of course not every edge-deletion is permitted along the way. As an example: for even n, the tempting construction of deleting every other peripheral edge of C_n^2 to finally reach a highly symmetric 3-regular minimal element of $\mathcal{M}_{|\cdot|,1}$ fails at its very last step, with the graph becoming bipartite and the codimension suddenly becoming two instead of one at the last edge-deletion.